

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 and 17-27 are pending in the present application. By this reply, claims 24-27 have been added. Claims 1, 3, 7, 8, and 10 are independent claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall (U.S. Patent No. 5,841,494) in view of Jones et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,963,284) and Kaneko (U.S. Patent No. 6,295,108). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

Regarding independent claim 1, the Examiner correctly acknowledges that Hall does not disclose a hologram diffuser and a linear polarizing transformer. To overcome this deficiency, the Examiner further relies on Jones et al. and Kaneko. In particular, the Examiner asserts that Jones et al. discloses a hologram diffuser as shown in FIG. 7.

However, as shown in FIG. 7, Jones et al.'s diffusing layer 61, including an acrylic polymer host material 63 and spheres 51, is not a *hologram* diffuser. That is, Jones et al.'s diffusing layer 61 uses the spheres 51 to diffuse light, which is one of the advantageous features of Jones et al.'s invention.

In clear contrast, Applicants' invention requires the use of a hologram diffuser, as recited in independent claim 1.

In the alternative, regarding dependent claim 17, the Examiner equates Jones et al.'s common electrode 15, shown in FIG. 7, to Applicants' planarization layer. However, Jones et al.'s common electrode 15 does not "planarize" its diffusing layer 61. Rather, Jones et al.'s common electrode 15, formed on the diffusing layer 61, has a wavy configuration. Thus, Jones et al. does not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a planarization layer as recited in dependent claim 17.

Kaneko does not overcome these deficiencies in the combination of Hall and Jones et al., since Kaneko is directed to and relied on for teaching a linear polarizer.

Therefore, even if the references were combinable, assuming *arguendo*, the combination of references would still fail to teach or suggest the invention as recited in independent claim 1 and its dependent claims (due to their dependency). Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall in view of Jones et al. and Kaneko as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Abileah et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,629,784). This rejection, insofar as it

pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

As discussed, the combination of Hall, Jones et al., and Kaneko does not teach or suggest at least the above-identified features of independent claim 1 from which claim 18 depends. Further, Abileah et al. does not overcome these deficiencies since Abileah et al. is relied on for teaching a backlight assembly. Thus, the combination of the applied references does not render obvious the claimed invention, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 3-6, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tedesco (U.S. Patent No. 5,418,631) in view of Davis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,822,029) and Abileah et al. This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

Regarding independent claim 3, the Examiner equates Tedesco's quarter-wave plate 122 to Applicants' $\lambda/4$ film. However, Tedesco's quarter-wave plate 122 is formed below both the upper and lower substrates and of an LCD panel 20. In clear contrast, Applicants' invention requires, *inter alia*, a $\lambda/4$ film above the lower substrate, as recited in claim 3. Neither Davis

et al. nor Abileah et al. overcomes this deficiency of Tedesco, because these references do not teach or suggest the use of a $\lambda/4$ film positioned above the lower substrate.

Therefore, even if the references were combinable, assuming *arguendo*, the combination of references would still fail to teach or suggest the invention as recited in independent claim 3 and its dependent claims (due to their dependency). Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 7, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tedesco (U.S. Patent No. 5,418,631) in view of Jones et al. This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

Regarding independent claim 7, the Examiner correctly acknowledges that Tedesco does not disclose the hologram diffuser above the liquid crystal layer. To overcome this deficiency, the Examiner further relies on Jones et al. However, as shown in FIG. 7, Jones et al.'s diffusing layer 61 is not a hologram diffuser, as discussed above. In clear contrast, Applicants' invention requires the use of the hologram diffuser over the liquid crystal layer, as recited in independent claim 7.

In the alternative, regarding dependent claim 21, the Examiner equates Jones et al.'s common electrode 15, shown in FIG. 7, to Applicants' planarization layer. However, Jones et al.'s common electrode 15 does not "planarize" its diffusing layer 61, but has a wavy configuration. Thus, Jones et al. does not teach or suggest the planarization layer as recited in dependent claim 21.

Therefore, even if the references were combinable, assuming *arguendo*, the combination of references would still fail to teach or suggest the invention as recited in independent claim 7 and its dependent claims (due to their dependency). Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 10, 11, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall in view of Jones et al. and Abileah et al. This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

Regarding independent claim 10, the Examiner correctly acknowledges that Hall does not disclose the holographic diffuser. To overcome this deficiency, the Examiner further relies on Jones et al. and Abileah et al. In particular, the Examiner asserts that Jones et al. discloses the holographic diffuser recited in claim 10.

However, as shown in FIG. 7, Jones et al.'s diffusing layer 61 is not a hologram diffuser and advantageously uses unique spheres 51 to diffuse light. Abileah et al. is relied on for teaching a backlight assembly.

Therefore, even if the references were combinable, assuming *arguendo*, the combination of references would still fail to teach or suggest the invention as recited in independent claim 10 and its dependent claims (due to their dependency). Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall in view of Jones et al. and Abileah et al. as applied to claim 10, and further in view of Kaneko. This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

As discussed, the combination of Hall, Jones et al., and Abileah et al. does not teach or suggest at least the above-identified features recited in claim 10 from which claims 13 and 15 depend. Kaneko does not overcome this deficiency, since Kaneko is directed to the use of a linear polarizer. Thus, the invention recited in independent claim 10 and its dependent claims (due to their dependency) is patentable over the applied references, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall in view of Jones et al. and Abileah et al. as applied to claim 10, and further in view of Davis et al. This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

As discussed, the combination of Hall, Jones et al., and Abileah et al. does not teach or suggest at least the above-identified features recited in claim 10 from which claim 12 depends. Davis et al. does not overcome this deficiency since Davis et al. is relied on for teaching a color filter. Thus, the invention recited in independent claim 10, from which claim 12 depends, is patentable over the applied references, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 8 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall in view of Jones et al., Kaneko, and Abileah et al. This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

Regarding independent claim 8, the Examiner correctly acknowledges that Hall does not disclose the hologram diffuser. To overcome this deficiency, the Examiner further relies on Jones et al., Kaneko, and Abileah et al.

As discussed above, Jones et al.'s diffusing layer 61 is not a hologram diffuser and uses unique spheres 51 to diffuse light. Kaneko is relied on for teaching a linear polarizing transformer, and Abileah et al. is relied on for teaching a backlight assembly.

Therefore, even if the references were combinable, assuming *arguendo*, the combination of references would still fail to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, "a hologram diffuser over the liquid crystal layer" as recited in independent claim 8 and its dependent claims (due to their dependency). Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall in view of Jones et al., Kaneko, and Abileah et al. as applied to claim 8, and further in view of Kondo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,198,520). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

As discussed, the combination of Hall, Jones et al., Kaneko, and Abileah et al. does not teach or suggest at least the above-identified features of independent claim 8 from which claim 9 depends. Kondo et al. does not overcome this deficiency since Kondo et al. is relied on for teaching a color filter.

Thus, the combination of references does not teach or render obvious the invention as recited in independent claim 8. Accordingly, the invention as recited in independent claim 8 and its dependent claims (due to their dependency) is patentable over the applied references, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

New Claims

Claims 24-27 are patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons their base claims are patentable as discussed above. Alternatively, these dependent claims emphasize additional distinguishing features of the present invention over the art of record. Accordingly, an indication of allowance of claims 24-27 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons and in view of the above clarifying amendments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw all of the rejections of record and to pass the application to issue.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone Esther H. Chong, Reg. No. 40,953, at (703) 205-8000.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By: 

Joseph A. Kolasch

Reg. No. 29,463

0630-1533

JAK:EHK:rk:lmh

P. O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000